



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ants are dealers in real estate and own a number of lots in the city of Boston. The respondent owns a house and lot abutting on two of the lots belonging to complainants and in close proximity to the others. Respondent has caused to be placed on the front of her house a large sign headed with the words "For Sale," and concluding with the words "Best Offer from Colored Family," all in large letters. She has also caused advertisements of like tenor to be inserted in a newspaper, and is threatening to sell her house and lot to a colored family. Complainants bring this bill to restrain respondent from maliciously interfering with their business by means of such advertisements and threats. The Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts holds that respondent has the right to advertise her property for sale by signs or otherwise in the usual way and to sell it if she sees fit to a negro family, even though the effect may be to impair the business of the complainants; that she has a right to ask for bids from white people or colored people, or both, and is not limited to bidders of any particular race or class or creed; and if one of her purposes in asking for bids from colored families is to annoy and injure the complainants, and she succeeds in doing so, her conduct is not thereby rendered unlawful so long as her object is to secure a purchaser for and to sell her house and lot. The bill is dismissed.

Actionable Shadowing.—Is any personal right violated by openly and publicly following and watching one, which practice is commonly called shadowing? In *Schultz v. Frankfort Marine Accident & Plate Glass Insurance Company*, 139 Northwestern Reporter, 386, plaintiff, who had been a witness adverse to defendants in an action, alleged that he was openly shadowed and followed for the purpose of annoying and intimidating him in order to get him to leave the city and refrain from testifying in the case if a new trial should be granted therein; that he was kept under constant surveillance; and that detectives set to watch and to eavesdrop at his home threatened him with violence and induced his employer to discharge him. It also appeared that they gave out to plaintiff's neighbors that he was being shadowed, and made themselves conspicuous by passing up and down on the sidewalk in front of his house and followed him at all times and places. In the above-entitled action plaintiff claims that by reason of these wrongful acts he was put in great fear, was prevented from coming and going as he pleased, and his reputation and good name defamed to his injury in the sum of \$5,000. A verdict was directed for defendant. Upon appeal the Supreme Court of Wisconsin holds that actual pursuit and public surveillance of person and home are suggestive of criminality fatal to public esteem and productive of public contempt or ridicule, so on this ground a case was made for the jury. Judgment is reversed.